

REMARKS

From the text of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected the claims because the computer program product is not limited to be stored on a storage medium. To overcome this rejection the limitation related to a storage medium has been added to claims 22 and 40. The additionally added limitations specify the technical effect (setting-up a connection in a network) of operation of the computer program product in order to show that its operation is not a mere manipulation of data. Basis for this amendment can be found on page 2, lines 5-9 and page 1, lines 8-9 of the PCT publication.

In response to the anticipation rejection based on U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0204619 to Bays, applicant does not agree with the Examiner's conclusion.

Claim 22 reads: "*computer program product, comprising: means for creating the RO which presents a user with editable fields relating to more than one type of the RO*". This means that the editable fields presented to the user are part of the computer program product.

The Examiner identified a data collector 90 as the computer program product. However, there is nowhere in the disclosure by Bays that the data collector 90 comprises a user interface that presents the user with editable fields for specifying what is required by claim 22. The Examiner also failed to find any disclosure of the data collector presenting editable fields to the user and therefore identified the routing control device 20 as the one that allows the user to enter information. Bays, however, fails to disclose that the data collector 90 and the routing control device 20 are one device. In the whole description and in all the figures of Bays the two devices are always presented as separate entities. Moreover, although the routing control device 20 allows the user to

supply information to the routing control device 20, it is not disclosed that this information is then sent to the data collector 90.

Additionally, careful analysis of Bays shows that the information provided by the user to the routing control device 20 results only in updating routing information changed by adding or removing a routing system (peer) to the routing control device 20. It is just a change of the configuration of the network resulting from said adding or removing of a routing system. Paragraph 41 reads “*The user must supply a nominal amount of information to have routing control device 20 configure a new peer (e.g., an inter-domain peer or internal peer) or modify an existing one.*” And “*Each time a new peering configuration—that is, the portion of the system rule set specific to the peer—is generated, the peering configuration state on the routing system 30 is compared with the last known good peering configuration saved in the routing control device database 24, if one exists, to ensure consistency and to detect any non-routing-control-device-20-introduced changes*”.

In the Bays’ disclosure the entering information by the user results in changing configuration, and the solution is focused on ensuring that, after the change of configuration, consistency of the system is preserved. The present invention as defined in the amended claim 22 is about creating Route Objects that define routes through network elements of the telecommunications network, which is used in creating a connection in the telecommunications network. These are two completely different solutions to different problems and there is nothing in the Bays’ disclosure that anticipates the amended claim 22.

Paragraph 59 cited by the Examiner deals with routing to a destination peer, but there is nothing in the Bays’ disclosure showing that user’s entered information is used in creation of the route.

Similar arguments are applicable to claim 40.

In view of the above differences the Applicant is of the opinion that the amended claims 22 and 40 are novel, together with their dependent claims.

Petition is hereby made for a one-month extension of the period to respond to the outstanding Official Action to July 21, 2008. A check in the amount of \$120.00, as the Petition fee, is enclosed herewith. If there are any additional charges, or any overpayment, in connection with the filing of this response, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any such deficiency, or credit any such overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 11-1145.

Wherefore, a favorable action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

KIRSCHSTEIN, OTTINGER, ISRAEL & SCHIFFMILLER, P.C.

Attorneys for Applicant(s)

425 Fifth Avenue

New York, New York 10016-2223

Tel: (212) 697-3750

Fax: (212) 949-1690



Alan Israel
Reg. No. 27,564